

General Questions

1. **Question (Q):** Do both parties involved in 8(a) mentor-protégé and JV agreements need to have DCAA approved accounting systems to bid?

Response (R): The KEMCON prime contractor is required to have a DCAA approved cost accounting system.

2. **Q:** What is the government's best estimate for the release the final RFP?

Q: When can offeror's expect the Federal Business Opportunities site for the Kennedy Environmental and Medical Contract (KEMCON) site to be next updated from Draft RFP to RFP stage?
<https://www.fbo.gov/?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=a64bc70ef44061dfc98dc3d9fd264be7&tab=core>

R: The RFP was posted on October 10, 2014 to the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS), and Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps) websites. The solicitation number is NNK14513883R.

3. **Q:** When can offeror's expect the Kennedy Environmental and Medical Contract site to be next updated from Draft RFP to RFP stage?
<http://procurement.ksc.nasa.gov/Kemcon/Comments%20Questions>

R: Offeror's should reference the NAIS and FedBizOpps website for the solicitation, any amendments to the solicitation, and the Government responses to questions.

4. **Q:** KEMCON Website – Many of the documents in the bidders library are NOT accessible. The URL's do not work. Will NASA please have IT review all URL's to ensure they are accessible?

R: The Government has and will continue to monitor the URLs for accessibility. If Offerors are experiencing issues with accessing the Bidder's Library and/or the Compliance Documents, the Government encourages them to immediately email ksc-kemcon-seb@mail.nasa.gov.

5. **Q:** Many of the Workload Indicators (WLI) do not provide sufficient insight to accurately assess the level of effort for PWS element that need to be priced and BOEs developed. Some PWS elements have no associated WLIs. Some PWS elements not enough WLIs are offered (the ones provided do not cover

the entire scope of work for that PWS element). Please provide complete WLIs that reflect the full scope of all PWS elements. Examples of missing or incomplete WLIs include the following (PWS numbers refer to Attachment J-01):

- a. PWS 4.4.3 (d) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element.
- b. PWS 4.4.4 – no WLIs are provided for the entirety of this PWS element.
- c. PWS 4.4.6 (a), (b), (c), (e), and (f) – no WLIs are provided for these PWS elements; the one WLI provided for PWS 4.4.6 appears to be associated only with 4.4.6 (d).
- d. PWS 4.5 (b) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element.
- e. PWS 4.5.1 (d) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element, such as the number/types of samples. (it is not clear whether the WLIs provided on page 7 of the WLI list belong with PWS 4.5.1 or PWS 4.7.4 because the titles and PWS numbers do not correspond – see additional comment below).
- f. PWS 4.5.2 (c) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element, such as the quantity/types of waste materials.
- g. PWS 4.5.2 (k) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element, such as the number of days/year that zinc paint waste is generated.
- h. PWS 4.5.2 (m) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element, such as the expected frequency and quantity of abandoned wastes.
- i. PWS 4.5.2 (o) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element, such as the how many times per year the transport of hypergolic wastes is required and in what quantities.
- j. PWS 4.5.2 (p) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element, such as how often or for how many activities this support is required.
- k. PWS 4.5.2 (bb) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element, such as how often or for how many containers this support is required.
- l. PWS 4.7.1 (g), (h), and (i) – no WLIs are provided for these PWS element, such as the number of samples or sampling events per year.
- m. PWS 4.7.3 (b) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element, such as a typical number of water line breaks per year.
- n. PWS 4.7.4 (a) – no WLI is provided for this PWS element, such as a typical number of locations investigated per year.
- o. PWS 4.8, Ecological Monitoring Program – the WLIs provided in this area do not appear to cover the entire scope specified in the PWS. Please provide additional WLIs with sufficient detail to enable our effort to provide an accurate estimate of the work in this area for the entirety of this work element (PWS 4.8 (a) through (s)).
- p. PWS 4.10 – The WLIs provided for this scope do not appear to cover the entire scope of this PWS. Please provide additional WLIs with sufficient detail to enable our effort to provide an accurate estimate of the work in this area (PWS 4.10 (a) through (d)).
- q. PWS 4.11 – no WLIs are provided for this PWS element.

- r. PWS 4.12 – no WLIs are provided for this PWS element, which has the potential to be highly variable and includes technical areas such as cultural resources which are unique to this PWS element.

Q: Please provide units for Workload Indicators where units are needed to understand scope. For example:

- a. Waste Management – Industrial wastewater transport and disposal, quantity is indicated as 250 with no units. Please specify units.
- b. Waste Management – Used oil transport and disposal,” quantity is indicated as 100. Please specify units.
- c. No units are indicated for WLIs in these WBS elements. Please specify units.

Q: The third Workload Indicator on page 10 is identified with PWS = 4.7.4 and has a definition that reads, “Pollution investigations – Typical response includes sampling of unknown materials and post-spill cleanup.” The reference to post-spill cleanup appears to be more consistent with PWS 4.6. Please confirm if this workload indicator is correctly associated with PWS 4.7.4 and if so, please clarify which sub-part of that PWS involves post-spill cleanup.

R: The WLIs are not intended to be a comprehensive list of every item that may be performed by the contractor. Offerors are cautioned that the WLIs within the Bidder’s Library provide historical data for information only. The offerors shall tailor their approach to the requirements described in the KEMCON solicitation. In response to the questions, the Government has reviewed the WLIs and determined that no additional WLIs will be added. The Government has clarified units and PWS references for a few of the items in PWS 4.0 in the WLI document dated 11/12/14, which will be posted to the Bidder’s Library in the near future. In addition, the Government has added the 2014 Ecological Monitoring Plan to the Bidder’s Library to provide additional information relative to the Ecological Monitoring Program.

6. **Q:** Please clarify the numbering mismatch between WLIs and PWS sections as some appear to be misaligned (WLIs, PWS, and PWS Section number and Attachment J-10). For example, the last two items on page 7 of the WLI list are identified as PWS = 4.5.1 and Section = “RCRA Corrective Action Sampling and Support.” These do not correspond to the PWS (Attachment J-01), where PWS no. 4.5.1 is titled “Waste Characterization and Sampling,” and the item titled “RCRA Corrective Action Sampling and Support” is identified as PWS 4.7.4. This is but one example; others are the WLIs for PWS 4.7.2 on pages 9-10 of the WLI list, PWS 4.7.4 on page 10 of the WLI list, and possibly others.

R: The Government cautions that when reviewing and comparing documents, to discard any documents associated with Draft RFP numbered “DRFP NNK14513883R” and refer only to the RFP numbered “NNK14513883R”.

7. **Q:** Please clarify the alignment of WLIs with regard to the KSC Environmental Sampling Plan. For example, the WLI for Limited Use Wells (page 9 of the WLI list) states 10 sampling events per year, whereas the Sampling Plan shows 9 locations each sampled annually, presumably in one sampling event. There are others which appear inconsistent with the Sampling Plan as well. Please confirm the WLIs are correct with respect to the KSC Environmental Sampling Plan or revise as necessary.

R: The WLIs are historical averages based on relevant contract activity over more than one fiscal year; whereas, the KSC Environmental Sampling Plan is specific to fiscal year 2015.

Data Requirement Deliverables (DRDs)

8. **Q:** PWS 2.9 and DR 2.9-001 reference the KSC Medical Operations Support Implementation Plan (MOSIP) and the JSC Medical Operations Requirements Document (MORD). Have not been able to find either reference in the bidder's library? Can these documents be added to the Bidders Library?

R: The Government has added a historical MOSIP, KSC Emergency Medical Services Plan, and MORD to the Bidder's Library for reference.

9. **Q:** DR 4.7-001 Block 8, states that initial submit is due within 30 days after contract award (7/1/2015). Box G states initial submission as 10/1/2015 (First day of contract). Please clarify the delivery date.

R: The initial submit delivery date is within 30 days of contract start. The Government has updated the DRD and it is reflected in the Amendment 00003 on the NAIS and FedBizOpps.

SECTION B – SUPPLIES/SERVICES and PRICES/COSTS

Section B.8 Non-Proposed Costs and Attachment L-03 Basic Cost Template

10. **Q:** REFERENCE: Contract Clause B.8 Non-Proposed Costs indicates that “If the actual cost of these vary by more than 10% from the non-proposed cost in a given contract year, then an adjustment to the estimated cost of the contract may be negotiated. These costs are not subject to fee per Section B Clause B.7(e), Costs Not Subject to Fee. Any adjustment to these costs shall not include an adjustment to the fee. Any such adjustment in negotiated estimated cost will be subject to the terms of the “Limitation of Cost” or “Limitation of Funds” clause hereof, whichever is applicable”

QUESTION: The language of section B.8 appears to suggest the Offeror may have financial liability if non-proposed costs are exceeded, even if total contract costs are within the constraints of the Limitation of Cost/Funds FAR clauses. Can you please provide further clarification on the government's intent of the 10% value in this clause?

R: If the non-proposed cost values are exceeded and the contract costs are within the constraints of the Limitation of Cost/Funds FAR clauses, the language of clause B.8 does not hold the contractor financially liable. The 10 percent value identified in clause B.8 establishes a threshold at which an adjustment to the non-proposed costs and estimated cost to the contract may be negotiated. The Government has updated the language in B.8 for clarity.

- 11. Q:** REFERENCE: L-03 BCT Instructions #8 – “Direct labor rate inputs are only in GFY 16, the base year (first year of the contract) for escalation application. All other GFY direct labor rates are calculated to escalate, as entered on the Labor Classification worksheet, from that GFY 16 rate (base year).”

ISSUE: Several areas of the electronic Excel spreadsheets provided for the attachment L-03 are 'locked' for input. It appears that without the removal of these locks to allow for data input, there is no automatic population of out-year data. For Example: The Labor Classification worksheet (columns F-J escalation) as provided does not allow for inputs in cells coded green. Therefore rates do not carry to the out years for pricing (Direct Labor GFY 17 – 20 worksheets) and hours do not populate into the PWS tables to derive total pricing.

QUESTION: Is it the government's intention to run a script against the spreadsheets post-submission to fully populate out-years (and thus the offeror should leave these elements blank), or may the offeror remove locks and input data and formulas where necessary to fully populate the out-year data and PWS tables?

- Q:** Attachment L-03, Basic Cost Template: Instructions Tab; line entry # 15 states: Software licenses associated with legacy applications that are part of the offeror's proposed MIS will not be Government provided. For proposal purposes, the offeror shall propose the acquisition and renewal costs for all licenses required for software applications/tools it proposes to use including the provisioning of "equivalent" licenses for non-highly specialized IT applications listed in Appendix XX, Government-Furnished Legacy IT Systems. All Government-owned data resident within the legacy systems will be available for transition into the offeror's proposed MIS. Attachment J-16 states: Note: The items listed in this table are Government-provided Legacy IT systems for use by the KEMCON Contractor. With the exception of the Earth Systems Modeling and Data Management System (ESMDMS), the sustaining

of the software systems, including modifications approved by the Government, will be provided by the Government.

Given our perceived conflict of statements as referenced in the Attachments L-03 and J-16 as referenced:

R: The Government has issued an updated Attachment L-03, Basic Cost Template, through NAIS and FedBizOpps as Amendment 00002 to solicitation numbered NNK14513883R, which revises the instructions.

SECTION G – CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA

G.16 CONTRACTOR-REPLACEABLE GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

12. Q: G.16.1 (a): When does NASA anticipate the ability for contractors to inspect GFP prior to contract award?

R: For proposal purposes, offerors shall assume that the Government-Furnished Property is in good working condition. All Government-Furnished Property will be available for inspection during phase-in. Clause G.16 has been updated for clarity.

13. Q: G.16.2 (c): Historically, how much cost has been incurred by the Incumbent Contractor for replacement of low value GFE?

R: The information requested is not available as it is proprietary. However, item costs and manufacturer information have been provided for the Government furnished equipment as part of the solicitation.

SECTION J – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment J-01, Performance Work Statement

14. Q: What system is currently being used to track chemical usage (1.7.7d)?

R: KSC does not use a Center-wide system for chemical inventory and tracking. The NASA Environmental Management Branch (EMB) requests Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) data from all onsite contractors annually. Per PWS 1.7.7(d), the KEMCON contractor is responsible for maintaining and managing their own chemical inventory and chemical tracking system. NASA uses an Excel spreadsheet to combine all the contractors' data for regulatory reporting purposes.

15. Q: With respect to records (1.5.7). Is the official record hard copy or electronic?

R: Refer to Clause H.10 for Records Management requirements.

16. Q: Please clarify/correct as needed the numbering system in the PWS (Attachment J-01). For example, pages 38 and 39 make reference to "Section 4.0" of the PWS, but no such section is indicated – it appears that Section 4.1 Environmental Services should be re-numbered as 4.0. As another example, PWS item 4.5 is followed by 4.4.1; one of these numbers (and possibly subsequent ones) should be corrected. These are only examples, there may be similar issues throughout the PWS.

R: Section 4.0 of the PWS is entitled "4.0 Environmental Services." References to Section 4.0 are intended to refer to Section 4.0 in its entirety. Section 4.5 is followed by Section 4.5.1 in the PWS. Please ensure that you are using the PWS as issued with the RFP.

17. Q: Section 1.4.2(g) states: Provide a cost correction (or error) tracking feature as part of the cost collection system. Log entries individually, validate entries, correct errors, and show disposition of reported errors. The system shall be able to accept entries by the Government. Is the "cost collection system" identified in 1.4.2(g) the same as the financial management system as defined in paragraph 1.4.2(a)? If so, is it the intent of NASA to enter data into the financial management system or to cost correction report generated from the financial management system?

R: Yes, the "cost collection system" identified in PWS 1.4.2(g) is the same as the financial management system as defined in paragraph 1.4.2(a), and the PWS has been revised to clarify. The Government has no intention of entering data into the Contractor's financial management system, only the Contractor will be entering data into this system; however, the Government expects to have access to the system to view data and print various reports. Regarding PWS 1.4.2(g), this item is describing an error tracking log for the financial management system. The error log does not have to be imbedded within the financial management system; however, the log shall be able to accept entries by the Government and must track errors, such as incorrect charging, in the financial management system and the correction/disposition of the error.

18. Q: The work scope for PWS 4.7.1 (a) appears to be redundant or overlapping with that for PWS 4.7.2 (a) and (b). Please clarify the difference between these work elements and provide WLIs for each.

R: PWS 4.7.1 consists of regulatory required environmental sampling, analysis, monitoring, and reporting. Sampling which is required by permit or by regulation. PWS 4.7.2 consists of operational sampling not required by regulation. Sampling that is done by operator's discretion to operate and manage the KSC potable water system. Please refer to the Environmental Sampling Plan in the KEMCON Bidder's library for required sampling for PWS 4.7.1. A WLI is provided for PWS 4.7.2.

19. Q: The work scope for PWS 4.7.4 (a) is open-ended; please clarify the nature and extent of assistance that is anticipated under this work element. Also, we note this PWS needs a companion WLI (it's missing).

R: The Government has removed section 4.7.4 in its entirety.

20. Q: We note in Section J-10: "With the exception of the Earth Systems Modeling and Data Management System (ESMDMS), the sustaining of the software systems, including modifications approved by the Government, will be provided by the Government. [emphasis added]" The PWS indicates (paragraph 1.5.1) that contractors are to implement a comprehensive MIS that leverages existing MIS (J-16). Specifically, contractors are to, "provide the IT systems and tools necessary, including hardware, operating systems, application software, firmware, displays, databases and data storage systems." Then Section J-16 indicates the government is will sustain these systems. Quoting from J-16: "... sustaining software systems, including modifications approved by the Government, will be provided by the Government. "

In view of above please clarify the KEMCON contractor's responsibility for software development, software maintenance, database query development, database development and general MIS support on the KEMCON program and across NASA KSC.

R: Section 1.5.2 of the PWS states "For requirements within this PWS that utilize Information Technology (IT) systems not provided by the Government, the Contractor shall provide the IT systems and tools necessary, including hardware, operating systems, application software, firmware, displays, databases and data storage systems." The note in Attachment J-16 states "The items listed in this table are Government-provided Legacy IT systems for use by the KEMCON Contractor. With the exception of the Earth Systems Modeling and Data Management System (ESMDMS), the sustaining of the software systems, including modifications approved by the Government, will be provided by the Government."

Therefore, the KEMCON Contractor shall provide software development, software maintenance, database query development, database development and general MIS support for contractor-provided systems. The Government will provide the sustaining of the software systems, including modifications approved by the Government, for the Legacy IT Systems listed in Attachment J-16.

21. Q: Section J.1.8.1 QA: The following question goes to impact of time and effort depending on where in the spectrum the current contractor is related to being compliant. Is the current contractor ANSI/ASQC/ISO 9001 compliant?

R: The only information available to the KEMCON offerors is the current language for the Medical and Environmental Support Contract (MESC) which is: "The MESC Contractor shall establish, implement, document and maintain a quality assurance program for evaluation of the internal processes, controls, metrics and procedures. The quality assurance program shall follow the guidance in ANSI/ASQC/ISO 9001-2000."

22. Q: Section J 2.2.a: Is the medical director required to be licensed in the State of Florida?

R: Yes, PWS Section 2.2(b) states "All physicians providing OM services shall maintain a state of Florida Medical license."

23. Q: Section J 2.2.k: Is the Aero Space physician required to be licensed in the State of Florida?

R: The RFP has been amended to clarify the Aerospace Medicine physician requirements in Attachment J-01, Section 2.2(k).

24. Q: Section J.2.2.h: Ambulance crew is under a separate contract. EMT requirements imply they may not be and the contractor will be responsible to provide certified EMTs as outlined? Please clarify.

R: As stated in RFP Attachment J-01, PWS Section 2.4(a), the ambulance staff, which are made up of paramedics not EMTs, are a part of the Kennedy Protective Services Contract. The KEMCON has specific responsibilities regarding Emergency Medical Services Medical Support as described in the RFP, Attachment J-01, PWS Section 2.4.

PWS Section 2.2(h) provides the license and certification requirements should the KEMCON Contractor choose to employ the staffing types described in

Section 2.2 as a part of their proposed approach to performing the KEMCON contract requirements. Section 2.2 states: "Medical services shall be performed by certified/licensed medical staff. The following section establishes the KEMCON training, certification, and licensure requirements for any medical staff utilized for medical services. This section is not meant to define the staffing types required, only to define the requirements should the Contractor choose to employ the following staffing types."

25. Q: Section J 2.3.1.f: What are the days and hours of operation of KSCVC?

R: The Kennedy Space Center Visitor Complex (KSCVC) days and hours of operation vary throughout the year. The KSCVC website provides the operating hours for the KSCVC.

Attachment J-12, Register of Wage Determination and Fringe Benefits

26. Q: Ref Wage Determination 2014-0447. The WD references a Collective Bargaining Agreement between InoMedic Health Applications, Inc. and International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, District Lodge 166 and Local Lodge 2061, effective April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2015

- a. Is this the only collective bargaining agreement in effect on the MESC?
- b. Will the Government provide a copy of the collective bargaining agreement as part of the solicitation?

R: WD 2014-0447 is the only CBA in effect for MESC. The document is provided in the Bidder's library located at <http://procurement.ksc.nasa.gov/kemcon>.

Attachment J-15, Instructions for Contractor 3rd Party Work

27. Q: Regarding work for others, after the work is approved by the CO, will the CO designate a COR in the serviced organization? Or will the main COR be responsible for all work on the contract?

R: Attachment J-15, Instructions for Contractor 3rd Party Work, provides instruction concerning 3rd party work.

Attachment J-16, Government-Furnished Legacy IT Systems

28. Q: Looking at the GFE list, we do not see MAXIMO listed. Further, we understand that KEMCON must use it for certain facilities related functions and

ACA requests. We notice that GFE list does not include MAXIMO. Should it be listed as a GFE item?

R: The KEMCON Contractor is not required to use Maximo in support of the Government's requirements listed in the RFP Attachment J-01.

29. Q: KSC uses Maximo. Does NASA's site license extend to KEMCON in a way that permits its use on the contract? Is there a charge for this license support?

R: Several KSC contractors utilize Maximo in support of their contract requirements. It is not currently used to satisfy the Government's Environmental and Medical requirements and therefore is not part of Attachment J-16, Government-provided Legacy IT Systems. In addition, there is not a mandate to utilize Maximo for the KEMCON scope; therefore, it was not listed as a Government-furnished service. The NASA Maximo Enterprise Licensing Agreement does not currently extend to the KEMCON contractor. If an offeror chooses to propose the use of Maximo, they shall utilize commercially available pricing based on their proposed use.

30. Q: KSC Uses MEDGATE. Does NASA's site license extend to KEMCON in a way that permits its use on the contract? Is there a charge for this license support?

R: MEDGATE is a NASA Agency Occupational Health Program purchased software package for NASA's Occupational Health Programs at all of the Centers. Currently the KSC Occupational Health Program is not using MEDGATE as a day-to-day tool, but is using the Health Unit Management System (HUMS) listed in Attachment J-16, Government-provided Legacy IT Systems. Although the NASA site license would extend to KEMCON in a way that would permit its use on this contract at no charge to the contract, it is the Agency's policy not to give individual Centers System Administrative privileges and MEDGATE would have to be used as provided without modification.

31. Q: Attachment J-16: Will there be any requirement for the contractor to update/maintain/input data/use MEDGATE?

R: PWS Section 2.1(d) states "Provide required data to the Agency Electronic Health Record System, managed by the Agency Occupational Health Program contractor." This is the only requirement in the KEMCON for supplying data into MEDGATE, which is the Agency Electronic Health Record System.

32. Q: What version of SharePoint is standard for NASA KSC? Does the version of SharePoint in use at KSC include all of SharePoint's features?

R: The NASA KSC SharePoint standard is SharePoint 2010 Enterprise. The Enterprise features are disabled. Organizations wishing to utilize the Enterprise features must purchase the appropriate Enterprise Client Access License for each user.

33. Q: Will NASA KSC permit the KEMCON contractor System Administrator (SA) privileges to Microsoft SharePoint for purposes of making modifications to it in support of KEMCON tasks?

R: The System Administrator function is an Information Management and Communication Support (IMCS) role that is part of KSC's contract for Data Center and Application support. Any changes required at the system/farm level will need to be requested through the Government so that the IMCS contractor can first implement changes in the test environment and deploy to production via the established deployment process. The highest permission level granted to users is Full Control, which gives the user site administration privileges.

34. Q: Does the government provide the software/version products listed in attachment J-16? If not, (assuming the offer intends to use all Legacy IT systems as is) please specify which of the J-16 listed software/version products will not be provided by the government (and thus needs to be priced).

R: Yes, the Government will provide the software/version products listed in Attachment J-16.

SECTION L – INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

35. Q: This section cautions offerors regarding Ostensible Subcontractor relationships. Suggest NASA to strengthen the final RFP's language by adding a Management sub-factor addressing the Offeror's analysis of key ostensible subcontract factors.

R: NASA does not intend to add a management subfactor to address the Small Business Administration's "Ostensible Subcontractor" rule, 13 CFR § 121.103(h)(4).

36. Q: L.11 references which sections count against page count and which sections that do not count against page count in the various Volumes that are to be submitted. Please clarify if the cover letter submitted with Volume II Relevant

Experience/Past Performance counts against the 45 page limit for the volume; or if the cover letter is excluded from Volume II's page count.

R: Any cover letter submitted with Volume II Relevant Experience/Past Performance shall count against the 45 page limit for the volume.

37. Q: Given the Offeror submits the Past Performance Volume on Dec. 3 as requested, will it be necessary to re-submit this same information as part of the Dec. 17 Proposal submittal?

Q: Ref L.14.j. The section states: The offeror shall submit two electronic copies of proposal Volumes I, II, and IV on CD-ROM (CD-R), designating one as "back-up" (in addition to the hardcopies specified above), in Adobe Portable Document File (PDF) format unless another format is specifically identified elsewhere in Section L. These PDF files shall be exact duplicates of the paper copies.

Clarification: Since Volume II will be submitted prior to Volumes I and IV, please confirm the Government is requesting Volume II be resubmitted with Volumes I and IV on one CD on 17 Dec 2014.

R: The Offeror shall submit a hard copy of Volume II, Relevant Experience/Past Performance one time only, and include the electronic version of the Past Performance Volume II on the CD submitted on December 17, 2014. Provision L.13 has been updated to clarify submittal requirements.

38. Q: Section I.17.B.1.f requests the first page for the Questionnaire be included in the Past Performance Volume. Page 1 of the questionnaire document (as shown in RFP Attachment L-02) is the Questionnaire transmittal letter from the Offeror to the respondent. Is it this Page 1 to which the Government is referring or is it Page 2 of the Questionnaire, that provides more contract identifying data, which the Government requires?

Q: REFERENCE: Section L.6 says: "Offerors are requested to provide the Contracting Officer a copy of page 1 of each past performance questionnaire (via email) at the same time the offeror provides the questionnaire to its references for completion. An additional copy of the first page of the questionnaire, identifying the past performance reference, shall also be included in the past performance volume."

QUESTION: From attachment L-02, Please clarify whether the term "page 1" refers to page 1 of 9 (Transmittal Letter) or page 2 of 9 (containing Sections 1 General Information).

R: The offeror shall submit a copy of the first page of the questionnaire. All other pages shall be filled out by the respondent.

39. Q: The second sentence in this paragraph reads, "The offeror shall submit past performance information on no more than five (5) previous or current contracts that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the KEMCON and (emphasis added) no more than three (3) for proposed subcontractors that will perform \$10 million or more of total KEMCON work." The construct of this sentence differs slightly with that of the Government response to draft RFP Question 64. Based on this final RFP language, we understand that NASA will permit up to 8 (5 for the Prime and 3 for any subs) Past Performance references to be submitted by an Offeror Team. Is this correct?

R: As stated in RFP section L.17 B., offerors are requested to submit information on no more than 5 of the most relevant contracts and no more than 3 for proposed subcontractors previously completed or currently on-going contracts within the past 5 years.

40. Q: Section L14.B. In a JV or mentor-protégé arrangement, is it necessary for the leading partner to demonstrate past performance citations that are of "similar in size, content, and complexity to the KEMCON" to be judged acceptable and responsive? Is there a minimum size (say \$5M total program value) that may be considered of "similar size and scope"?

R: Offeror shall submit past performance in accordance with section L.17 B. It is the offeror's responsibility to determine which of its previous contracts are of similar in size, content, and complexity to the KEMCON. Additionally, the offeror may submit additional information at its discretion (within page limits) if they consider such information necessary to establish a record of relevant performance.

41. Q: This section states "Only contracts which are being performed or completed in the past 5 years will be considered as recent." With regard to the relevant experience narrative, typically the offeror can provide information on contracts that are relevant but the contract period of performance may not fall within the time constraints specified for the past performance references -- in this case 5 years. Please confirm that the relative experience narrative may include Corporate experience outside the 5 year window.

R: Per Section L.17 B., only contracts which are being performed or completed in the past 5 years will be considered recent.

42. Q: Section L section states "The offeror may submit additional information at its discretion (within page limits) if they consider such information necessary to establish a record of relevant performance." Please confirm that any additional information provided by the Offeror will be evaluated and included in the Government's assessment of Offeror's past performance.

R: The Government will consider information provided in accordance with Section L.17.B

43. Q: Often subcontractors prefer to submit their individual Total Compensation Plans directly to the Government in a sealed envelope (versus included in the Prime's proposal) due to the proprietary pricing nature of the information. NASA RFP's generally provide for such a separate submittal but this KEMCON RFP does not. If this is a concern then we should ask a question such as: Due to the proprietary pricing information included in the Total Compensation Plan, will NASA allow separate sealed submittal of the subcontractor Total Compensation Plans?

R: The Government will allow separate sealed submittal of the subcontractor Total Compensation Plans within the specified time and due date.

44. Q: In Section L.14.A.1.b.iii, Note: The offeror shall provide copies of joint ventures and partnerships in Volume IV, Plans and Other Data. Please explain what you mean by "partnership" and if it defines a prime-subcontractor relationship.

R: Assuming this question is for the RFP NNK14513883R, Section L.17.D. Section 4, the Government is requesting copies of joint ventures and partnerships formed to act as a potential prime contractor. Prime-subcontractor relationships are not considered partnerships, see FAR 9.601.

45. Q: Section L.14(g) states that the requested RFP cross reference matrix (evaluation criteria element versus Offeror's proposal page numbers) is excluded from the respective Volume page restriction. However, in Section L.15(c) these matrices are not listed along with the title pages and table of contents as being specifically excluded from the proposal page count limits. Will the Government please clarify L.15(c) to include matrices in the list of required proposal content items that are excluded from the specified page limits?

R: Per Section L.14 g., the matrices are excluded from the page count limitations provisioned in Section L.15.

46. Q: Under section B.1 the Government prescribes the format and sequence for the Past Performance Volume. Sections a, b, c, d, and g are limited to a total of 45 pages. The responses to sections e and f are not page limited. Is it permissible to include sections e and f as Appendices to the Past Performance Volume and thus simplify the page numbering approach to this Volume?

R: Yes.

47. Q: Section L section 2.2 Basis of Estimate: All of the Section L related to BOEs were deleted from Volume 1 leaving Section 2.2 absent content requirements. Please clarify exactly what the government expects proposals to address in response to Section 2.2. Also, please clarify how whatever content should be contained in this sections is to be evaluated?

R: Section L, Provision L.17 Specific Proposal Preparation Instructions, A. Volume I – Mission Suitability, 2. Subfactor B – Technical Approach, b. Basis of Estimates directs you to Provision L.17 Section D for instructions on submitting the basis of estimates. The Government expects basis of estimates to follow the format provided in Provision L.17 Section D. Volume IV – Plans and Other Data, and the Government expects the basis of estimates to be included in Volume IV, Plans and Other Data, as stated in the table in Provision L.15.

Section M, Provision M.3 Mission Suitability Factor, A. Weights and Scoring, 2. Subfactor B – Technical Approach, b. Basis of Estimate states that “The offeror’s Basis of Estimate(s) will be evaluated for reasonableness, consistency with the proposed approaches, and alignment with the staffing plan.”

48. Q: L.17.D.7.i "The offeror’s BOEs shall be submitted in MS Word to allow exporting to MS Excel.BOE." We addressed this in a previous question #58. Question: The pull down list names L-14 as Summary of Exceptions; Our question is related to L.14. A. Subfactor B.b.iii. We believe submission in Word with export to Excel should read submit in Excel then export to Word. If you build in Word and export to Excel, there are no formulas and/or links for traceability to 3rd level PWS. Can you clarify?

Q: Ref L.17.D.7.i Basis of Estimates. The section states “The offeror’s BOEs shall be submitted in MS Word to allow exporting to MS Excel.” Some offerors will likely use Excel to create Basis of Estimates. May offerors submit the Basis of Estimates in MS Excel format instead of MS Word?

R: The Government has updated Section L.17 for clarification.

49. Q: L.17.A.2.b requires Basis of Estimate to be provided in Volume 1, Subfactor B. L.17.D.7 also requires Basis of Estimate to be provided in Volume IV. Does NASA consider the BOE part of the total page count limit under Volume 1 or would they consider removing the requirement under Volume 1 since it is also a requirement of Volume IV?

R: Section L, Provision L.17 Specific Proposal Preparation Instructions, A. Volume I – Mission Suitability, 2. Subfactor B – Technical Approach, b. Basis of Estimates directs offerors to Provision L.17 Section D for instructions on submitting the basis of estimates. The basis of estimates shall follow the format provided in Provision L.17 Section D. Volume IV – Plans and Other Data and the basis of estimates shall be included in Volume IV, Plans and Other Data as stated in the table in Provision L.15.

50. Q: L.4: Since the employees on this contract are high tenure positions and NASA desires to level the proposal playing field for proposals as evidenced by providing “non-proposed costs” that all proposers will use, will the Government consider releasing relevant salary ranges for positions on this contract by position type? Even using regional or national data will have some significant standard deviation as the tenure of the positions is much longer than considered in most models.

R: The information requested is proprietary and is not available.

51. Q: L.17.A.1.d Total Comp Plan. Does NASA consider the Total Comp Plan as part of the total page count in Volume 1 or would they consider removing that requirement under Volume 1 since it will be part of Volume IV anyway?

R: The Total Comp Plan is required to be submitted in Volume IV only, per provision L.17 D.

52. Q: *Ref. L.14.f. The section states: “All pages of Volumes I, II, III, IV, and V shall be numbered and identified with the offeror’s name, RFP number and date. In addition, for each copy of each proposal volume the offeror shall identify with the following legend the copy number for each volume (legend: Volume __, Copy __ of __). Subsequent revisions, if requested, shall be similarly identified to show revision number and date.”*

Clarification: Please confirm that offerors are required to provide the legend (Volume __, Copy __ of __) on the cover of each volume and not on each page of each volume.

R: The legend is required to be on each page of each volume.

53. Q: Please clarify whether the KEMCON contract is responsible for the cost associated with maintenance and calibration of test equipment (including medical devices, monitoring devices, meters, test equipment, etc.). We understand the contract is responsible for making sure that maintenance and calibrations are performed. We are unclear if the KEMCON contract is expected to incur the cost necessary to perform maintenance and calibration (either performed by KEMCON staff or vendors hired by KEMCON) or if the contract receives this service from another NASA contract (e.g., the ISC).

R: Calibration will be provided as a Government-furnished service and the KEMCON contract is not responsible for the costs associated with calibration. Attachment J-06 has been revised in the RFP Amendment 00003 to reflect this change. Maintenance not related to calibration is the responsibility of the KEMCON Contractor and shall be included in the KEMCON contract costs (e.g., maintenance costs for Government-furnished test equipment and Government-furnished vehicles).

54. Q: Please clarify the number of launches, along with the nature and extent of assistance expected from the KEMCON contract, in support of Launch Monitoring. The workload indicators for this task seem completely dependent on the number of launches, and type of launch, that may be expected in an average year.

R: Prospective offerors are referred to the Launch Manifest provided on the Bidder's Library as well as the description of work in the PWS and the associated DRDs and WLIs.

55. Q: Will the Government please clarify which cost are not to be used in a shared cost pool accounts?

R: Per Section 1.4.2 e. of the PWS, "the offeror shall develop, recommend, and implement strategies for proper allocation of costs among all customers by PWS without the use of shared "cost pool" accounts."